

sisted in providing water for the guest to wash his own feet. This was what Simon should have done for Jesus, and to show him how little respect he had shown, he contrasted his conduct with the act of the woman who bathed his feet with her tears.

The washing of feet then carried with it the same etiquette that hand-washing does now. It is no breach of courtesy not to wash the hands of your guest when he comes to visit you; but if his hands are dirty, it is expected that you will get water and a wash basin and set them out to him. But there was this difference on the side of the washing of feet alluded to in the Bible in the article copied: it was an act of special honor, and regarded as a sign to the visitor that he was very welcome and his company was very desirable. To them it was esteemed as the social glass is now esteemed to drinkers of wine. It meant, "Come in and be one of the company."

We turn to Exodus and we find a hand-washing and foot-washing that is altogether different. This foot-washing is neither an act of civil decency nor an evidence of social esteem; but terrible to angels. We copy the whole passage, as it is more than likely the average reader never read it in his Bible, and would not take time to hunt it up.

Exodus 30th chapter, 17th verse. And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, 18. Thou shalt also make a laver of brass, and his foot also of brass, to wash withal: and thou shalt put it between the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar, and thou shalt put water therein.

19. For Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and feet thereat: 20. When they go into the tabernacle of the congregation, they shall wash with water, that they die not; or when they come near to the altar to minister, to burn offering made by fire unto the Lord:

21. So they shall wash their hands and their feet, that they die not; and it shall be a statute forever to them, even to him and to his seed throughout their generations.

This was not exactly an act of worship, but it was an act of preparation, and a very solemn one too. It was a religious ordinance in the fullest sense of the word, and the Levitical Priesthood observed it from Aaron to the last one who officiated in the temple at Jerusalem.

Why did the western editorial man ignore this passage totally? Because it is a strong testimony against every premise that he has laid down in his answer; and in so doing he deceives the innocent reader about the character and standing of washing feet in Bible times.

Let it be noticed that the penalty was death for neglecting to wash feet as the Lord commanded Moses, and further that it was a statute forever throughout their generation.

Christ established his church and he took this same ecclesiastical or religious foot washing and translated it into his church and provided for its perpetuation in these words: "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet, for I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." There is no death penalty attached to this commandment, but a reward is promised for obedience. "Happy are ye if ye do them," and this means also you won't be happy if you don't.

As a result of this brief inquiry, we have a foot-washing in the Old Testament that may be classed as an act of hospitality, and one that is a religious ordinance enforced by a statute from the Lord with the penalty of death for neglect. We have also a foot washing in the New Testament, 1 Tim. 5: 10, which is an act of hospitality, or is classed with good works; and we have one, John 13th chapter, that is a religious ordinance that the children of God are to perpetuate; and this foot washing is the ordinance of Moses so changed as to be appropriate for the church of Christ. Aaron was a priest and washed his feet, and Christ was a priest and he washed feet, and commanded his disciples to wash feet. This washing of feet is not an act of hospitality nor of civil decency in any sense it may be viewed, but an holy ordinance and a test of our loyalty to our Master, a reminder of our baptismal cleansing and a lesson of humility—one of the plainest commands of the New Testament.

In proof of the foregoing, history might be examined, but we do not wish to occupy too much space with this subject now. But let it be known that the ordinance has been observed from the apostles down. EVERY CHURCH ON THE FACE OF THE GLOBE THAT HAS REGULARLY PRACTICED TRINE IMMERSION, OBSERVES FOOT-WASHING, in some way or other, with more or less of its members or clergy engaging in the practice.

The ordinance is observed by the Bishops of Russia, by the Patriarch of the orthodox Greek church; it is kept in the Church of Milan and came down from the early centuries; it existed in the Spanish churches about as long as they kept trine immersion; and some mention is made of it by nearly all of the great writers of the primitive church.

Where churches venture to put away the Lord's baptism, we think it not strange if they put away the holy ordinance of washing the Saints' feet.

Hold on to foot washing brethren, it is O. K.

The part of the article that treated the subject of "kissing" has not been copied, but it was treated in about the same style.

A. L. GARBER.

#### Reasons Why I Left The German Baptist Church.

BY J. B. LAIR.

Having been a member of the German Baptist church for a quarter of a century, its rules of course became something like a second nature. But there were some things in the practices of that church that I could not reconcile with the Word of God. So far as I have been able to understand the gospel, it is consistent with itself, and I apprehend that it is consistent with God's NATURE, and I must then think that the church of Christ is consistent with itself and with God's law as well and what I could not understand was how that the German Baptist church could lay claim to the gospel alone as its rule of government, and that the gospel was an all sufficient rule of life, unto salvation to all that obeyed it. And then make other things a test of membership—about which the Bible is as silent as the grave.—This inconsistency I could never reconcile—e. g. Annual Meeting of 1817 art 1, decided that if members would not quit chewing tobacco they could not be elected to any office in the church, also Annual Meeting of 1822, declares that the use of tobacco is "a shamefully bad habit," and every thing that is bad is sin, and sin defileth, etc."

Annual Meeting of 1864 art 19, declares it "an evil" and as to the use of it says "it is wrong." Annual Meeting 1870 art 20, classes it with "other vain and useless things." Now in the face of all this denunciation of the evil, who ever heard of these decisions being respected, enforced—or one member expelled for the use of it, or an elder's office being taken on account of it, and his disregard of the decisions—not one echo answers NOT ONE.

But who don't know of these same elders, with chews of tobacco in their mouth, going all about the country, enforcing the Annual Meeting decisions against good and faithful and zealous members, because they were not "in the order in dress."

Could any sane person conceive for a moment that such inconsistencies could exist in the church of Christ?

I found when I came west that I was expected to preach order and Annual Meeting; and was repeatedly requested to do so, but not being versed, nor one bit zealous on the order question, I could never make it suit the occasion, but by the way when it came to Annual Meeting and I would happen to touch up the tobacco slaves a little, I found that they would become offended. So much again for consistency—always being in a habit of preaching the gospel as the Lord gave me ability, I still did so, but behold, there were those who did not like it, they said I "talked too plain, and too forcible." Such would have admired order preaching, but could not endure the gospel.

Coming as I did to the Olatha church where Isaac Studebaker was elder—and a most zealous elder too—zealous for the order coat, and the cap and bonnet, etc., and against the full beard, etc. We came to swords points almost at once. I found him not only to possess no religion but clothes religion, but I found him to be an untruthful man, as well as I am able to prove. However his eldership was replaced by that of S. S. Mohler, and then my persecution began in earnest. Mohler is well qualified to conduct a persecution as I found by experience—and had he have lived in the days of the inquisition, he would have made a valuable member in that august body, I must say to his praise. Mohler then had as helpers and assistants,

one J. H. Neher. Another member of the body of persecutors was one J. H. Crist who by the way was not above reproach.

Of course it became their imperative duty to find charges against me, which they were capable of doing. Mohler found them—read them—and asked "what I had to say." I answered nothing, but the proof I was kindly informed that the charges would "obtain" unless I disproved them. Then I denied and demanded the proof. Mohler made answer that he had inquired about them and found that they were true in the main.

I asserted then as I do now that the charges were false in every sense, and the presumed cause never had an existence, and I demanded of them to show wherein I had violated the gospel in any sense, or even one Annual Meeting decision, or done one immoral act, if they could. Not one dared to speak except Mohler—undaunted by his illegal and wicked proceedings I summed up courage enough to say that I "would not hear the church," and went on to say how he "had defined so and so," etc., and that the honor of the church must be maintained, etc., etc. I told him that I had letters in my pockets wherein he had wrote two ways about one thing which involved him in a falsehood, and that I could prove others guilty of the same thing, and I had enough of such men and proceedings, and taking the advice of the apostle—"from such turn away." I took up my hat and left the august presence of his highness, never to return again. Of course the church did its work. I would not bow to the mandates of a dictator in the person of one who is not only untruthful, but devoid of all Christian charity and courtesy. I now feel relieved to get rid of such tyranny—such inconsistent tyranny—I might have endured tyranny, but such inconsistent tyranny, usurped by a poor erring, fallible man—no one ought to endure for a day. Oh what will God's judgments be upon such men. I pity them, my sympathy goes out for them, poor deluded mortals assuming to domineer over God's children. Indeed their end will be lamentable. May the Lord pity them is my prayer.

#### Baptism and the Laying on of Hands.

BY S. B. FURRY.

We have no command and no instance in the gospel of the laying on of hands and prayer over an applicant at baptism while in the water. But on the other hand we have one, when not in the water, Acts 8: 14 to 18, and all other allusions favor that instance. At Christ's baptism it could not have occurred. See Mat. 3: 16, Mark 1: 10. "Straightway" means immediately, without delay, or without loss of time; and the alighting of the Holy Ghost and voice of commendation occurred after he was out of the water. The commission does not teach it. See Mat. 28: 19, Mark 16: 15, 16, Luke 24: 47.

Acts 8: 14 to 18, shows that it could not have been done in the water at the time of baptism, but proves they were not in the water, unless they went the second time into the water, which no sensible person would admit. Acts 19: 6, does not convey such an idea, unless it could be admitted they spake with tongues and prophesied in the water, which are all in one sentence and very close connection. This would be no sensible conclusion as the act of baptism is in another sentence, disconnected and closed with a period. All other acts of baptism are entirely silent of either laying on of hands or prayer over the applicant so far as I can find. In Heb. 6: 2, Paul makes baptisms and laying on of hands separate doctrines with others proceeding and following. It is a doctrine and ordinance following baptism and not necessarily to be observed immediately after baptism in the water. We might just as well argue that the "resurrection of the dead," and "eternal judgment," follow baptism in the water. It is not apostolic, but simply a custom, and finally made a tradition and obligatory by men uninspired. But the laying on of hands and prayer is apostolic when done out of the water, as we have a positive instance upon record. Acts 8: 16, 17, and all other reference favoring it. This is simply a reply to the accusations against the Brethren by such men as the boisterous Jesse Calvert.